

program guide implemented on user television equipment,
comprising:

means for displaying the advertisements on
the user television equipment with the interactive
television program guide; and

means for collecting information on the
usage of the advertisements in the interactive television
program guide by collecting information on the number of
times each advertisement is displayed.

35. (Amended) A method for monitoring
advertisement usage in a system in which advertisements are
displayed for users by an interactive television program
guide implemented on user television equipment, comprising
the steps of:

displaying the advertisements on the user
television equipment with the interactive television
program guide; and

collecting information on the usage of the
advertisements in the interactive television program guide
by collecting information on the number of times each
advertisement is displayed.

REMARKS

Objections to the Specification

In the Office Action, the word "that" on page 20, line 19 was objected to for being repeated. Applicants respectfully submit that the repeated use of the word "that" is grammatically correct. Reconsideration of the objection is respectfully requested.

Applicants have corrected the specification to provide the application serial number at page 27, line 27 as requested by the Examiner.

Claims 69-118

In the Office Action, claims 69, 70, 77-83, 86, 89, 90, 100-106, 109, 112, 113, and 115-118 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hendricks et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,181,335). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants' independent claims 69 and 92 relate to collecting real-time ratings information based on the activities of users, and displaying the real-time ratings information on the user television equipment in real-time. For example, real-time ratings for the most popular television programs in the nation may be generated. Real-

time ratings may also be generated for non-program guide applications.

In the system of Hendricks, "set top terminal 220 can maintain an accurate record of all programs accessed/watched by storing the data" (col. 14, lines 54-56). However, nothing in Hendricks shows or suggests collecting real-time ratings information based on the activities of users, let alone displaying such real-time ratings information on user television equipment in real-time. While Hendricks discloses the hit movies category of recently released movies (FIG. 16 and col. 32, lines 17-20), these movies have been found popular amongst movie goers, and this hit movies listing is not based on user activities at user television equipment. Claims 69 and 92 are therefore allowable. Claims 70-91 and 93-114, which depend from claims 69 and 92 are in condition for allowance because claims 69 and 92 are allowable.

Claims 115 and 116 relate to displaying program guide display screens with an interactive television program guide implemented on user television equipment. Information on which program guide display screens are displayed by the guide is collected. The advantage of this approach is that information such as which advertisements are used and which screens are displayed may be analyzed to

determine the relative value of various advertisements and program guide screens (page 3, line 27 to page 4, line 2).

The set top terminal of Hendricks can "maintain an accurate record of all programs accessed/watched by storing the data" (col. 14, lines 54-56). However, nothing in Hendricks describes collecting information on which program guide display screen are displayed by a program guide. Claims 115 and 116 are therefore patentable.

Claims 117 and 118 relate to providing an opportunity for a user to use non-program-guide applications on user television equipment. Information on which non-program-guide applications are used with the interactive television program guide is collected. A non-program-guide application may be, for example, a video game application. The program guide may monitor which video games are played by the user.

In the system of Hendricks, "set top terminal 220 can maintain an accurate record of all programs accessed/watched by storing the data in EEPROM or RAM" (col. 14, lines 54-56). However, nothing in Hendricks shows or describes collecting information on which non-program-guide applications are used by the user. Claims 117 and 118 are not anticipated by Hendricks and are therefore in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-68

Claims 1-18, 20-26, 29-31, 33-52, 54-60, 63-65, and 67-68 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schein et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,412,110) in view of Seidman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,298,482). In addition, claims 19, 27-28, 53, and 61-62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schein et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,412,110) in view of Aras et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,872,588). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 35 relate to displaying advertisements to users with an interactive program guide implemented on the users' television equipment. Information about the usage of advertisements by the users in the program guide is collected.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to incorporate the features of claim 6 and have amended claim 35 to incorporate the features of claim 40. In particular, have amended claims 1 and 35 that information may be collected on the usage of advertisements by determining the number of times each advertisement is displayed.

As stated in the Office Action, Schein does not explicitly disclose collecting information on the usage of advertisements. Seidman relates to monitoring user

activity in order to customize video programs received by subscribers. However, the system of Seidman merely collects information on the video selections of a subscriber. It therefore only monitors the video that is displayed, and does not collect information on the usage of advertisements or the number of times such advertisements are displayed. Therefore, neither Schein nor Seidman, alone or in combination, show or suggest all of the claim elements of claims 1 and 35.

Claims 1 and 35 are therefore patentable over Schein in view of Seidman. Claims 2-34 and 36-68, which depend from claims 1 and 35 respectively, are therefore patentable because claims 1 and 35 are patentable.